IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

UNITED	STATES	OF	AMERI	CA,
--------	--------	----	-------	-----

Plaintiff

V.

Franklin Abbott (2),

Defendant

Criminal No. 16-730 (PAD)

MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Re: Amendment 821

The below report and recommendation relates to an initial determination as to the defendant's eligibility for a sentencing reduction promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission under Part A and Part B, Subpart 1 of Amendment 821 to Policy Statement § 1B1.10(d).

After careful review of the defendant's presentence report, charging document(s), plea agreement, plea supplement, judgment, and statement of reasons, I recommend that:

\square The defendant is <u>not</u> eligible for a sentence reduction based on the following factor(s):
☐ A. The guidelines range that applied in the defendant's case was not determined by U.S.S.G. § 4A1.1(d) or defendant's status as a zero-point offender under Chapter 4, Part A.
\square B. The defendant does not meet <u>all</u> of conditions specified by § 4C1.1. Specifically, one or more of the following criteria applies:
☐ 1) the defendant has criminal history points from Chapter Four, Part A;
☐ 2) the defendant received an adjustment under U.S.S.G. § 3A1.4 (Terrorism);
\square 3) the defendant used violence or credible threats

of violence in connection with the offense;

☐ 4) the offense injury;	resulted in death or serious bodily	
\square 5) the offense	of conviction was a sex offense;	
☐ 6) the defend financial hard	dant personally caused substantial ship;	
transported, disposed of a	ant possessed, received, purchased, transferred, sold, or otherwise firearm or otherwise dangerous weapon another participant to do so) in the offense;	
	se of conviction was covered by L.1 (Offenses Involving Individual	
3A1.1 (Hate Cr	ant received an adjustment under § ime Motivation or Vulnerable Victim) rious Human Rights Offense).	
3B1.1 (Aggrava	dant received an adjustment under § ting Role) and/or was engaged in a minal enterprise, as defined in 21	
subpart 1 does no	of Amendment 821 Part A and Part B, t have the effect of lowering the icable guideline range. See	
D. The defendant was originally sentenced to a term of imprisonment that is less than or equal to the minimum of the guideline range as amended by Amendment 821 Part A and Part B, subpart 1, and no exception for substantial assistance applies. See § 1B1.10(b)(2)(A).		
minimum imprisonmen with the safety val reduction of his o departure for subst	s sentenced to a statutorily mandated term. The defendant did not comply we provisions and did not receive a her imprisonment term based on a antial assistance or a Rule 35 motion riginal sentence. See § 1B1.10(c).	

Since a determination of ineligibility has been made, the

 □ The defendant may be eligible for a sentence reduction and therefore the matter is referred to a United States District Judge.

The presiding judicial officer shall wait for the parties' stipulation of a sentence reduction within fourteen days. If no stipulation is reached within this period, the presiding judicial officer shall wait for the United States Probation Office, defense counsel, and the Government's memoranda, which shall be filed within another fourteen days.

Reasons:

Abbott was sentenced to 210 months as to Count One. He was sentenced at Offense Level 33, Criminal History Category III. He received two criminal status points for committing the offense while under a criminal justice sentence. Under Amendment 821, he would no longer receive these two points and his Criminal History Category would be lowered to II. His new applicable guideline sentencing range is 151-188 months. As such, Abbott may be eligible for a sentence reduction.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 11th of April, 2024.

s/ Bruce J. McGiverin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE